



## FEDERAL NATIVE LIAISON PROGRAM REVIEW

## DISCUSSION PAPER

I. INTRODUCTION:

No comprehensive review of the Federal Native Liaison Program has ever been carried out. From the point of view of both government and carrier agencies, such a review would be useful for providing a basis for policy-making and for possible future evaluation of the program.

Liaison programs and services generally have very similar goals, but their day to day functioning can be expected to differ, sometimes significantly, as a result of differences between contracts, differences between carrier agencies, differences between the regions of Correctional Services of Canada in which the contract is administered and the level of security of the institutions. The above does not take into consideration the differences between communities in which the institutions are situated -- for example, the resources available to the liaison staff and inmates in Prince Albert are likely to be very different from those available in Winnipeg to the Stony Mountain Institution.

If it is the intention of the Corrections Service to eventually either evaluate the program or to standardize policy

AN 31 1986

4  
NCSA.

POLARPAM

POLAR  
PAM  
906





across the country in some way, then a program review to discuss the more obvious differences between programs should be carried out first. This review would discuss the "structural" and procedural aspects of the programs, and the overall context in which they operate. The review would describe also what liaison staff actually do and what the institutions actually provide in the way of resources.

## II. SPECIFIC AREAS OF INVESTIGATION: (not exhaustive)

### a) Factors to do with CSC

- i) National Policy
- ii) Terms of the contracts held with the different regional headquarters or institution
- iii) The reporting relationship between the carrier agency (or individual) and the institution and regional headquarters
- iv) The general "attitude" of institutional and RHQ staff towards Native programs in general and Native Liaison programs in particular
- v) The resources available to liaison programs and Native programming in general and Native Liaison programs in the institution and the region -- i.e. office space? Brotherhood meeting space?
- vi) The number of liaison staff and institutions within the region
- vii) The size and proportion of the Native population in the region institutions.

### b) Factors to do with the Carrier Agency

- i) The size of the agency and the resources available to it.

across the country in some way, then a general review to discuss the results of the field mission in the view of the staff which the mission should be carried out.

These results should be discussed in the "national" and "regional" reports.

Aspects of the mission which may be of interest to the staff, etc.

operator. The mission will be able to liaison with the agency.

do not want the mission to be seen as a whole by the agency.

It is intended by other agency staff members as

to be a part of the mission, assistance with programs.

self turnover in liaison positions.

"preparation" of the agency as a whole with a view to the

to do with the institution

to be a part of the mission, assistance with programs.

for liaison and the institution and regional

the security level and the way that the mission

perceived to affect liaison programming, and Native

The "attitude" of institutional staff to the

programming, available to liaison programs and Native

to be a part of the mission, assistance with programs.

Resources available within the community.

friendship circles and other native organizations

and their willingness to visit and assist

staff.

Some indication of the "climate" of the mission in the

with respect to liaison and Native

to be a part of the mission, assistance with programs.

to be a part of the mission, assistance with programs.



- ii) The priority with which the liaison program is viewed within the agency.
- iii) Other resources available within the agency - e.g. administrative support, research capability, etc.
- iv) Training available to liaison officers by the agency.
- v) The support given to liaison staff by the agency -- e.g. attendance by other agency staff members at meetings and workshops, assistance with problems, provision of replacement staff when required.
- vi) Staff turnover in liaison positions.
- vii) The "prestige" of the agency as a whole within the justice system.

c) Factors to do with the Institution

- i) The inmate population and distribution of sentence length.
- ii) The proportion of Native inmates.
- iii) The security level and the way that security is perceived to affect liaison programming.
- iv) The "attitude" of institutional staff to Native programming.

d) Factors to do with the Community

- i) Resources available within the community, especially friendship centres and other Native organizations, and their willingness to visit and assist liaison staff.
- ii) Some indication of the "climate" of the community with respect to penitentiaries and inmates, particularly Native inmates.



iii) The size of the community and the distance from Native centres such as reserves, colonies, etc.

iv) Availability of halfway houses and aftercare facilities.

While the above suggests a tidy division between the different factors which could be investigated, many of these questions are overlapping. There are in addition several questions of a more complex nature, for example, while CSC would have its requirements for liaison services written into the contract, the carrier agency might have its own requirements of liaison staff over and above these. A "mini-job audit" would not only clarify what is expected, but also what is actually done. (It would not be possible to rely only on the statistics or activity sheets used by the liaison staff, because it would be the practice to record only the categories included on the statistics sheet and not necessarily all the other activities. Similarly the majority of activities recorded give no indication of the amount of time required to perform the task, or the other activities associated with it -- for example, "Holding a workshop").

### III. METHOD

The previous section has dealt with what might be investigated. This section discusses how the study would be carried out --

a) It would be preferable for the same person(s) to be involved in the whole study from beginning to end. While this is a lot of work for one person, it does ensure consistency of approach at least.







b) As this study is intended as a review, only those areas where there is currently a liaison program should be investigated. It it's not the purpose of this study to determine whether or not there should be a liaison service in, for example, the Quebec region. (This does not preclude including comments which might be made on such a subject.)

c) While reference has been made here to Carrier Agencies, the intention is to include liaison programs where they are supplied through a personal service contract arrangement -- for example, in Prince Albert institution.

d) As wide a range of perspectives should be sought -- from CSC administrative staff in Ottawa and the regions, to institutional staff and inmates. The carrier agencies would of course be approached, as would other organizations with an interest -- e.g. friendship centres, Poundmaker's Lodge and other alcohol treatment centres, half-way house staff, citizen's advisory committees and anyone else who would have a legitimate interest in the Native Liaison Program.

e) The most desirable approach would be to complete the study in as informal a manner as possible. Rather than using a paper and pencil questionnaire -- or even a tape recorder. A flexible interview schedule should be used to allow information collection to occur in as free and conversational manner as possible. This kind of approach can minimize the likelihood of receiving the "party line" from the people approached. More formal information would of course be gathered, for example, statistical information with respect to the number of clients and others dealt with by liaison staff.





While the liaison staff do not necessarily work for the Native Brother/Sisterhood organizations they generally support Brotherhood activities. Native Brother/Sisterhood members will therefore be approached for their views.

f) The areas covered in the interview schedule would follow the questions outlined in Section II of this paper.

A preliminary budget and time frame is included as follows:

Sources of Information: (not exhaustive)

1. Pacific Region (B.C.)

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| a) Institutions | William Head<br>Matsqui<br>RPC<br>Mountain<br>Kent<br>Elbow Lake<br>or<br>Ferndale<br>Mission<br>Robson Centre  |
| b) Agencies     | A.I.M.S. B.C. & A.I.M.S. House<br>RHQ Pacific<br>Lower Mainland Parole<br>B.C. Courtworkers Association<br>Mission & Vancouver Friendship<br>Centres<br>Citizens Advisory Committees<br>Groups which regularly visit the<br>institutions - i.e. Chehlis<br>Reserve Women's Group<br>John Howard Society |

2. Prairie Region (Alta.)

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| a) Institutions | Edmonton Institution<br>Drumheller Institution<br>Grierson Centre<br>Bowden Institution   |
| b) Agencies     | Native Counselling Services of Alberta<br>Poundmaker's Lodge<br>Old Sun College<br>Edmonton & Calgary Friendship Centres<br>Nechi Institute<br>Citizens Advisory Committees |











The areas requiring the greatest attention would be the Pacific, Prairie, and Ontario regions. The proposed time frame would include a maximum of five days in the B.C. region (unless William Head is included in which case a longer period may be required). The Prairie region, because of the distances involved would be expected to take twice as long (10 days). A further five days should be allowed for the Ontario region (including National Headquarters in Ottawa) and three for the Atlantic region. The amount of time spent in the regions in information collecting activities could realistically be limited to 23 days. (one working month approximately). A further two months should be allowed for information confirmation, write-up, and typing.

Given that it is now September and the time frame allows for three months (preferably uninterrupted), it is suggested that the information-gathering begin in mid-January. This would avoid the Christmas period (which begins in mid-December in institutions) and allow plenty of time for planning, developing the interview schedule, identifying information needs of government and agencies, etc. These planning activities would take approximately three weeks. The time frame would then be extended to three and a half to four months.



PROPOSED BUDGET

LIAISON PROGRAM REVIEW

Salary & Benefits

4 months at \$2,644.00 per month	\$9,576.00	
Benefits at 9%	861.84	
		<u>\$10,437.84</u>

Travel & Accommodation

Air fares (January 1983 prices)

Edmonton to and from		
Vancouver	266	
Saskatoon	206	
Winnipeg	334	
Ottawa	640	
Moncton	794	
		<u>2,240.00</u>

Car rental (Estimated) 20 days	600	
gas, mileage, parking etc. (Estimated)	500	
		<u>1,100.00</u>

Accommodation (1) night X \$45.00)	765.00	
Subsistence (22 days X \$28.50)	627.00	
		<u>1,392.00</u>

* <u>Typing, telephone, clerical etc.</u>		
at 15% of wages & benefits	1,565.68	
		<u>1,565.68</u>
		<u>16,735.52</u>

<u>Contingency (5% of total)</u>		
includes unexpected increases	836.92	
in airfares, delays etc.		<u>836.92</u>

TOTAL BUDGET		<u><u>\$17,572.24</u></u>
--------------	--	---------------------------



DATE DUE	
99999	Pam:347.96: (*41) NCSA
Federal Native Liaison Program review : discussion paper.	
Borrower's Name	Date Due

99999	Pam:347.96: (*41) NCSA
Federal Native Liaison Program review : discussion paper.	

Boreal Institute for Northern  
Studies Library  
CW 401 Bio Sci Bldg  
The University of Alberta  
Edmonton, AB Canada T6G 2E9



University of Alberta Library



0 1620 0328 6281